

# THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF  
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

**B. LEWIS, CH. PELLAT AND J. SCHACHT**

ASSISTED BY J. BURTON-PAGE, C. DUMONT AND V. L. MÉNAGE AS  
EDITORIAL SECRETARIES

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME II

C—G

FOURTH IMPRESSION



LEIDEN  
E. J. BRILL  
1991

Kānūni, found himself assured of wealth, high office and protection at the Porte.

He became Agha of the Janissaries in 982/1575 and retained this appointment until 986/1578. During the next phase of his career he saw much active service in the long Ottoman-Persian war of 986/1578-998/1590. He was *Beglerbeg* of Van in 991/1583, assumed command, in the same year, of the great fortress of Erivān—he was now raised to the rank of Vizier—and also had a prominent rôle, once more as *Beglerbeg* of Van, in the campaign of 993/1585 against Tabriz. As *Beglerbeg* of Baghdād, an appointment which he received in 994/1586, Çighāla-zāde fought with success in western Persia during the last years of the war, reducing Nihāwand and Hamadān to Ottoman control.

After the peace of 998/1590 he was made *Beglerbeg* of Erzurum and in 999/1591 became Kapudān Pāshā, i.e., High Admiral of the Ottoman fleet—an office that he held until 1003/1595. During the third Grand Vizierate (1001-1003/1593-1595) of Khodja Sinān Pāshā he was advanced to the rank of fourth Vizier. The Ottomans, since 1001/1593, had been at war with Austria. Çighāla-zāde, having been appointed third Vizier, accompanied Sultān Mehmed III on the Hungarian campaign of 1004-1005/1596. He tried, but in vain, to relieve the fortress of Khaṭwān (Hatvan), which fell to the Christians in Muḥarram 1005/September 1596, was present at the successful Ottoman siege of Eğri (Erlau) (Muḥarrem-Şafer 1005/September-October 1596) and, at the battle of Mezö-Keresztes (Hâç Ovası) in Rabi' I 1005/October 1596, shared in the final assault that turned an imminent defeat into a notable triumph for the Ottomans. Çighāla-zāde, in reward for his service at Mezö-Keresztes, was now made Grand Vizier, but the discontent arising from the measures which he used in an effort to restore discipline amongst the Ottoman forces, the troubles which followed his intervention in the affairs of the Crimean Tatars, and the existence at court of powerful influences eager to restore Dāmād Ibrāhīm Pāshā [q.v.] to the Grand Vizierate, brought about his deposition from this office, after he had been in control of the government for little more than a month (Rabi' I-Rabi' II 1005/October-December 1596).

Çighāla-zāde became *Beglerbeg* of Shām (Syria) in Djumādā I 1006/December 1597-January 1598 and then, in Shawwāl 1007/May 1599, was made Kapudān Pāshā for the second time. He assumed command, in 1013/1604, of the eastern front, where a new war between the Ottomans and the Persians had broken out in the preceding year. His campaign of 1014/1605 was unsuccessful, the forces that he led towards Tabriz suffering defeat near the shore of Lake Urmiya. Çighāla-zāde now withdrew to the fortress of Van and thence in the direction of Diyārbekir. He died, in the course of this retreat, during the month of Rajab 1014/November-December 1605.

**Bibliography:** Selānikī, *Ta'riḫh*, Istanbul 1281 A.H., 198 ff., 292, 299, 334, 342-343; Pečevi, *Ta'riḫh*, ii, Istanbul 1283 A.H., 25, 87, 97 ff., 107, 111-112, 191, 192, 197, 198, 204 ff., 261 ff., 284; Ewliyā Čelebi, *Seyāhat-nāme*, vii, Istanbul 1928, 157, 179, 180; Na'imā, *Ta'riḫh*, Istanbul 1281-1283 A.H., i, 146 ff., 167 ff., 172 ff., 368, 379, 387-388 (*Dijghāla-zāde Sinān Pāshā oghlu Maḥmūd Pāshā*), 393 ff., 425 ff.; Iskandar Beg Munshi, *Ta'riḫh-i Ālam Ārā-i Abbāsi*, Tehran 1955-1956, i, 311 ff., 403 ff., 470 and ii, 635, 656, 660-672 *passim*, 678-685 *passim*, 695, 702-705 *passim*, 768, 769; S. Gerlach, *Tagebuch*, Frankfurt-am-

Main 1674, 27, 217, 244-245, 265-266, 269; G. T. Minadoi, *Historia della Guerra fra Turchi et Persiani*, Venice 1588, 221-222, 307, 315-317 *passim*, 324, 326, 330, 344, 345; L. Soranzo, *L'Ottomanno*, Ferrara 1599, 10-12; *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant* 1584-1602, ed. Sir W. Foster (Hakluyt Society), London 1931, 319 (index); C. Hughes, *Shakespeare's Europe* (Unpublished Chapters of Fynes Moryson's Itinerary), London 1903, 26 and 46; Purchas His Pilgrimes, viii, Glasgow 1905, 311, 313, 316, 320; *Ambassade en Turquie de Jean de Gontaut Biron, Baron de Salignac*, 1605-1610 (*Correspondance diplomatique et documents inédits*), in *Archives Historiques de la Gascogne*, fasc. 19, Paris 1889, 12, 19, 20, 21, 30 and also 393-397 *passim*; G. Sagredo, *Memorie Istoriche de' Monarchi Ottomani*, Venice 1673, 665, 671, 684, 749-750, 751-752, 759-761, 767-769, 773 and 830-838 *passim*; E. Alberi, *Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti al Senato*, ser. 3, Florence 1840-1855, i, 380, ii, 143, 180, 249, 288-292 *passim*, 355-356 and iii, 292, 374, 424-432 *passim*; N. Barozzi and G. Berchet, *Le Relazioni degli Stati Europei lette al Senato dagli Ambasciatori Veneziani nel secolo decimosettimo*, ser. 5: Turchia, Pt. I, Venice 1866, 34, 38, 39; E. de Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor*, iii/2 (1576-1600), Bucharest 1888, 215, 225; *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*: 1581-1591, London 1894, 583 (index), 1592-1603, London 1897, 582-583 (index) and 1603-1607, London 1900, 551 (index); I. Rinieri, *Clemente VIII e Sinan Bassà Cicala. Studio storico secondo documenti inediti*, Rome 1898 (also to be found in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, ser. 16, vols. 9 (Rome 1897), 693-707 and 10 (Rome 1897), 151-161, 272-285, 671-686, and ser. 17, vol. I (Rome 1898), 165-176); G. Oliva, *Sinan-Bassà (Scipione Cicala) celebre rinnegato del secolo XVI: Memorie storico-critiche*, in *Archivio Storico Messinese*, Anni VIII-IX, Messina 1907-1908; Hammer-Purgstall, iii, 423 and iv, 17, 44-45, 86, 171-180 *passim*, 229-230, 245, 248, 261, 264, 268-272 *passim*, 287, 301, 321, 330, 332, 358-359, 376-379, 620, 633, 669-670; N. Jorga, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, iii, Gotha 1910, 183-185; H. Laoust, *Les Gouverneurs de Damas*... (658-1156/1260-1744): *Traduction des Annales d'Ibn Tulūn et d'Ibn Ġum'ā*, Damascus 1952, 196 (Sinān Pacha b. al-Gaffāl); 'Othmān-zāde Tā'ib, *Hadīqat al-Wuzarā'*, Istanbul 1271 A.H., 47 ff.; Sāmī, *Kāmus al-Ālām*, iii, Istanbul 1308 A.H., 1822; *Sidjill-i 'Othmāni*, iii, iii and iv, 319 (*Dijghāla-zāde Maḥmūd Pāshā*); I. H. Uzun-çarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, iii/2, Ankara 1954, 235, 354-357, 391; *IA*, s.v. Çighāla-zāde (M. Tayyib Gökbilgin).

**CILICIA.** The name. In Assyrian writings the name Khilakku refers primarily to the western part of the region, Cilicia Trachea, but also includes a part of Cappadocia, whilst the Cilician plain is called the Kué. In classical times the name Cilicia covered both western and eastern parts, Cilicia Trachea and the plain of Cilicia. The name does not occur among the Arab geographers, who call Cilicia simply the region of the *thughūr* [q.v.], or frontier towns. The form Kilikiya (or Kilikiyā) is not met until modern times (see Ibn al-Shihna, *al-Durr al-muntakhab*, 180), but it is a direct derivation of the ancient name if, as is thought, the Turkish name for Cilicia Trachea, İç-İl or İçel [q.v.] (lit. 'the interior region') in fact comes from Kilikia.

Geographical outline. Cilicia is wedged

between the Anatolian plateau to the north-west and the Syrian frontier to the south-east. Its southern edge is fringed by the Mediterranean, which here reaches its most easterly extremity, and it is guarded to the north by the Taurus range, over which the Cilician Gates assure communication with the plateau. To the east are the Amanian Gates (al-Lukām), and to the west, a short distance beyond Selindi (ancient Selinonte), begins the province of Pamphylia (region of Adalia). Cilicia has at all times possessed a great strategic importance on account of the Cilician and Amanian Gates. Although the mountains and sea which isolate Cilicia have given it a marked individuality, it has rarely been able to maintain its own independence for long, even when it was the kingdom of Lesser Armenia or the Turcoman principality of the Ramaḡān-oghlu. Most of the time, from the Hittites to the Ottomans, it has been incorporated by conquest into the great empires of the eastern Mediterranean.

Cilicia falls naturally into three geographical regions, Cilicia Trachea, the Cilician Taurus, and the Plain of Cilicia. Cilicia Trachea (lit.: 'rough, rugged') is a mountainous region to the west, its coast dotted with ports where pirates took refuge when chased by Pompey's ships. It is virtually without means of communication to the Turkish interior, and has patches of cultivable land only in a few valleys, such as Gök Su (ancient Calycadnus) whose waters flow into the sea near Silifke. It is consequently a very poor region, and contains only a few small towns (Silifke, ancient Seleucia, Mut, on the road from Silifke to Karaman and Konya, and in the west Anamur on the coast and Ermenek inland).

The frontier between Cilicia Trachea and the coastal plain on the one hand and the Taurus on the other is the small river Lamos which has its spring in the Taurus. The Cilician Taurus is a strip 300 km. long by only 50 km. wide stretching in a south-west-north-east direction, and including the massifs of Dumbeleḡ, Bulḡhar Daḡ (corruption of Bughā, the Turkish translation of Taurus) and the Ala Daḡ, one peak of which rises to 3600 m. The Ala Daḡ continues northwards to the Ḥaḡḡin Daḡ. The Anti-Taurus begins to the east, on the left bank of the Zamanti Su, formerly Karmalas, a tributary of the Sayḡhān (Saros). Its mountains can easily be crossed, however, as the high waters have cut many valleys through them in forcing their way from the Capadocian plateau down to the Mediterranean. The Ṭarsūs Ćay, ancient Cydnus, in Arabic Baradān, rises in the Bulḡhar Daḡ massif and brings Tarsus its water. Between the Bulḡhar Daḡ and the Ala Daḡ are the valleys of the Ćakḡt Su and Kōrkūn Su, the Ćakḡt being a tributary of the Kōrkūn which in turn is a tributary of the Sayḡhān. The road called the Cilician Gates climbs over passes and runs through these valleys. On the northern side it connects Tarsus with Ulukīshla via Bozantl (ancient Podandos-Budandūn) where the narrowest defile, the Cilician Gates properly so called, is at Gülek Boghaz, 1160 m. high on the upper reaches of the Ṭarsūs Ćay.

The most important part of Cilicia is the plain (Greek Pedias, Turkish Ćukurova), a product of the alluvial deposits of its two large rivers, the Sayḡhān (ancient Saros) and the Dīayḡhān (ancient Pyramus). Along the left bank of the Dīayḡhān's lower reaches is a less elevated outcrop of the Taurus range, the Dīabal al-Nūr or Dīabal Miṣṣiṣ. Sheltered from the

north by the great mountain barrier, the Cilician plain is open to the southern winds, enjoys the climate and flora of Mediterranean regions, and is extremely fertile. Crops peculiar to hot countries can be grown there, and apart from sugar-cane plantations there is also intensive cultivation of cotton. The main towns of Cilicia were always situated in this area. To the north, at the foot of the Taurus but still Mediterranean in climate, lie Sis (at the present day Kozan) and 'Ayn Zarba (ancient Anazarba), to the south Miṣṣiṣa (Mopsuestia) on the Dīayḡhān, Adana on the Sayḡhān, Tarsus, Ayās (ancient Aigai) on the western coast of the gulf of Alexandretta, and Alexandretta on its eastern side. Mersin, to the west of Tarsus, is a relatively recent town, today named İĉel.

In the Islamic epoch Cilicia Trachea and Seleucia belonged to the Greeks, the frontier between the two empires being formed by the Lamos (in Arabic Lāmīs).

Under the Ottomans Cilicia constituted the wilāyet of Adana, and was divided between the *sandjaks* of İĉ-II, Adana and Kozan in the north, and of Dīebel Bereket around the gulf of Alexandretta.

The main towns of Cilicia are connected by the Aleppo-Fevzipaṣha-Adana-Ulukīshla railway, with a branch line running via Tarsus to Marsina.

Cilicia has often been stricken by earthquakes; Michael the Syrian (iii, 17) and Ṭabarī (iii, 688) record the one which occurred on 23 June 803; it blocked the river Dīayḡhān and partly destroyed the walls of Miṣṣiṣa. Another one occurred in 1114 (see EI<sup>1</sup> s.v. MIṢṢIṢ). The most recent occurred in 1952.

*Bibliography:* K. Ritter, *Die Erdkunde von Asien. Allgemeine Erdkunde*, xviii & xix, Klein-asien, Berlin 1858-59; V. Cuiet, *La Turquie d'Asie*, Paris 1890-95, ii, 3-108; W. M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, London 1890, 349 ff., 361-387; Le Strange, chap. ix; Pauly-Wissowa, xi, 385 ff.; E. Banse, *Die Türkei*, 1919, 165-185; R. Blanchard, *L'Asie Occidentale*, vol. viii of the *Géographie Universelle* by Vidal de la Blache & Gallois, 69 ff.; Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks*, 98-100; Cl. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades*, 1938, 134-155; M. Canard, *Hist. de la dynastie des Ḥamdānides*, i, 278-285; see also the special monographs by Favre & Mandrot, *Voyage en Cilicie*, 1874, in *Bull. de la Soc. de Géogr.*, 1878; and V. Langlois, *Voyage dans la Cilicie et les montagnes du Taurus*, Paris 1861.

Historical outline. When the Arabs had conquered Syria, Heraclius ordered the garrisons of towns between Alexandretta and Tarsus to evacuate their positions (see MIṢṢIṢ). It is probable that part of the civilian population had to do likewise. The Arabs did not immediately take over these towns, but restricted themselves to raids into the region or across it into Anatolia, leaving small garrisons behind them as a security measure. On his return from an expedition in 31/651-652, Mu'āwiya is said to have destroyed all the fortresses as far as Antioch. However, records exist of the Arabs' capture of Tarsus in 53/672-673, which seems to indicate that it had been reoccupied by the Greeks or defended by its inhabitants. In 65/685, furthermore, the army of Constantine Pogonatus advanced as far as Mopsuestia (Miṣṣiṣa). From 84/703 onwards the Arabs began to settle in Miṣṣiṣa, stationing a garrison there during part of the year. They realized the advantage which would accrue in permanently

holding the Cilician positions, and 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz abandoned his plan to destroy all the fortresses between Mişṣiṣa and Antioch. Sīs, at the foot of the Taurus, was captured in 103/751-732. In the first decades of the second century of the *hidjra* it became apparent that the Arabs intended to settle in the area; Mişṣiṣa was colonized by the Zoṭṭ [q.v.] with their buffaloes, and a bridge was built over the Sayḥān to the east of Adana, in order to secure communications across the country. Although the Arab armies had no difficulty in traversing the country by way of the Cilician Gates, its occupation was still precarious. There was as yet no systematic organization of the frontier strongpoints, or *thughūr*, still dependant on the *djund* of Ḳinnasrīn, which Mu'āwīya or Yazīd b. Mu'āwīya had detached from Himṣ (cf. Ibn al-Shihna, 9). But already the positions had been transformed into *ribāt*, that is to say posts manned by voluntary defenders of the faith, noted for both their religious and military zeal. Al-Dīnawarī, 345, points out that after his dismissal from office Khālīd al-Kaṣrī [q.v.] obtained from the caliph Hishām permission to go to Tarsus, where he remained for some time *murābiʿan*.

After the 'Abbāsīd revolution the Byzantines did not take advantage of the disturbed situation to reconquer Cilicia, but instead concentrated their attention on the regions of Malaṭya and Kālīkalā. After the dynasty had become firmly established, and particularly in al-Mahdī's reign, the 'Abbāsīds undertook to fortify and populate the Cilician positions, above all at Mişṣiṣa and Tarsus. Hārūn al-Raṣhīd was the most vigorous exponent of the frontier policy. In 170/786-787 he detached the frontier strongholds from the *Djazira* and *djund* of Ḳinnasrīn and put them under a separate government called al-'Awāsim [q.v.] (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 604; Ibn al-Shihna, 9); Cilicia now became part of the 'Awāsim *djund*. Its reorganization served both defensive and offensive purposes; it helped protect Muslim territory against Byzantine incursions (cf. a poem of Marwān b. Abī Ḥaṭṭa in Ṭabarī, iii, 742), provided a secure operational base for the Muslim armies which, by tradition, carried out one or two raids each year into Greek territory, and served as a permanent base for volunteer troops and *murābiʿūn*. The fortification of the positions went in hand with the launching of expeditions across the Cilician Gates during the reign of Hārūn al-Raṣhīd and his successors. A vital step in the successful execution of these operations was the Muslim capture of Lulon (al-Lu'lu'a) in 217-832. Its fortress guarded the northern side of a pass which led over the Cilician Gates from Podandos (Budandūn, present-day Bozant) to Tyana.

A considerable Christian population lived in the strongholds or the countryside around them. The Muslims recruited some of them as guides for their expeditions (see *AIEO Alger*, xv, 48), but they also sometimes acted as informers for the Byzantines, and it was perhaps as an act of reprisal that al-Raṣhīd had all the *thughūr* churches destroyed in 191/807 (Ṭabarī, iii, 712-713; Michael the Syrian, iii, 19 ff.).

The small river Lamos, demarcation line between Cilicia Trachea and Arab Cilicia, was periodically the scene of the exchange of prisoners or their resale to the enemy; historians have left their records of these dealings, in particular al-Mas'ūdī in *Tanbih*, 189-196.

After Mu'taṣim's famous campaign against Amorium in 223/838, which marks the end of the

spectacular expeditions into Anatolia, it gradually became the custom to appoint special amīrs to Cilicia, mostly resident in Tarsus. Although nominally dependant on the 'Awāsim governor or the ruler of Syria, they enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy and were responsible for the defence of the country and the organization of annual land and sea expeditions. Some of the amīrs of Tarsus became quite famous, e.g., 'Alī al-Armanī, the eunuch Yāzmān (Greek Esman), Ghulām Zurāfa (alias Leo of Tripoli) and Raṣhīk al-Wardāmī (Damyāna, Ṭamal, Naṣr al-Ṭamalī). For some time Cilicia, with its 'Awāsim and *thughūr*, passed from the control of the central government and became a dependency of Ṭūlūnid Egypt (260/873-286/891). This was a troubled chapter of its history, due to the dispute between the Ṭūlūnids and the central power, the intractability of the amīrs, and the ravages incurred through Byzantine raids. The return of Lu'lu'a (Lulon) to Byzantium in 263/876-877 constituted a serious threat to Cilicia. Nevertheless the *ribāt* of Tarsus developed during that period, and assumed greater proportions, as is shown by the sources used by Kamāl al-Dīn in the geographical introduction to his *Bughyat al-Ṭalab* (see *AIEO Alger*, xv, 46 ff.) and the descriptions of al-Iṣṭakhṛī and Ibn Ḥawḳal (see *TARSUS*). In particular, the caliph al-Mu'tazz and his mother spent great sums on maintaining special units of *murābiʿūn* under military and religious leaders. At a time when the spirit of holy war gave a particular character to Cilicia, there flocked to the country a great number of scholars, traditionists, ascetics and fervent religious men, intent on fulfilling the personal obligation of *djihad*, teaching the old traditions and spreading a spirit of purest orthodoxy among the soldiers and the civilian population. The more well-known of them were Ibrāhīm b. Adham b. Maṣṣūr [q.v.], who died some time between 160 and 166 (776-783), and Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Fazārī (d. 188/804) (Ibn 'Asākir, ii, 254). Several of these persons are mentioned in the obituaries of al-Dhahabī and Abu 'l-Maḥāsīn, often carrying the *nisba* of *Thaghrī* or *Tarsūsī* (see under 181, 196, 273, 297 etc.). Yāḳūt (iii, 526) also noted their arrival in great numbers (cf. i, 529). It is known that Aḥmad b. Ṭūlūn was educated at Tarsus. Muslim festivals were celebrated in great brilliance there. Abu 'l-Maḥāsīn (iii, 60) considered the feast of breaking the fast in Tarsus to be one of the four wonders of Islam.

In the first part of the 4th/10th century Cilicia came under the rule of the Ikhshīd, the governor of Egypt, who received his investiture from the caliph. After the clash between the Ikhshīd and the Ḥamdanīd amīr Sayf al-Dawla, who won control of northern Syria and Aleppo, the governor of the frontier province submitted to the amīr of Aleppo, and the amīrs of Tarsus henceforth participated in Sayf al-Dawla's expeditions. But the Tarsus fleet, weakened by the policy of the caliph al-Mu'taḍid, who had had it destroyed, was only a minor factor in the struggles of the 4th/10th century. In the second half of the century the threat of Byzantium from the north caused constant disturbances and rebellions, and the operations of 352/963-354/965 resulted in the complete reconquest of Cilicia by the Greeks (or Byzantines). It remained Byzantine for more than a century, during which time the outflow of Muslims was accompanied by a considerable inflow of Armenians, stimulated by the Byzantine practice of using Armenian officers to administer the country. After the Salḍjūkid raids had driven back those Armenians

who had settled in Cappadocia after the Turkish conquest of Armenia, their number now increased once more, and, after the battle of Manzikert in 1071, a virtual Armenian principality was created, stretching from Melitene to Cilicia. Its head was the Armenian Philaretus, a former general of Romanus Diogenes, and he established his capital at Mar'ash (see Chalandon, *Alexis Comnène*, 95 ff.; J. Laurent, *Byzance et les Turcs Seldjoudes*, 81 ff.; idem, *Byzance et Antioche sous le curopalate Philarète*, in *Rev. des Et. arm.*, ix (1929), 61 ff.; Grousset, *Histoire des Croisades*, I, xl, ff.). The Armenian chiefs Oshin of Lampron (present-day Namrûn Yayla, north-west of Tarsus) and Ruben of Partzept (north of Sis) were perhaps his vassals. They retained their fiefs when Philaretus departed from the scene, defeated by the Turks. The Turks had ravaged Cilicia even before Manzikert, and shortly before the arrival of the Crusaders (Michael the Syrian, iii, 179) they seized the main towns, though failing to subjugate the Armenian princes in the Taurus. The latter joined forces with the Crusaders in 1097 and helped Baldwin of Boulogne and Tancred to reconquer the Cilician towns. There followed a period in which the towns continually changed hands in the struggle between Byzantium and the Frankish principality of Antioch. Alexis Comnenus recaptured them from Bohemond of Antioch, only to lose them once more to the latter's nephew Tancred, who in 1103 handed them over to his uncle upon his release from the imprisonment imposed by the Dānīshmandid of Malatya. In 1104 they were retaken by the Byzantine general Monastras (Anna Comnena, XI, xi, 6; ed. Leib iii, 49). They remained the scene of dispute until 1108, when Bohemond was forced to sign a treaty acknowledging the authority of Alexius Comnenus over the whole of Cilicia (Anna Comnena, XIII, xii, 21; ed. Leib iii, 134-135). His nephew Tancred however did not abide by the treaty.

The descendants of Ruben continued to consolidate the development of an Armenian state, and sought to bring all of Cilicia under their control. Thoros I, who had driven off the Saldjūkid in 1107-1108 (Tournèze, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie*, 171; Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades*, 253; Matthew of Edessa, in *Hist. arm. des Croisades*, i, 84-85), captured Sis and Anazarba from the Greeks. During the reign of his successor Leo I (1129-1137), Bohemond of Antioch attempted to re-establish his authority in Cilicia, but this brought him into a fatal conflict with another aspirant to Cilicia, the Dānīshmendid of Cappadocia (Michael, iii, 227). Around 1132 Leo captured Tarsus, Adana and Mişşisa from the Greeks (Chalandon, i, 235, ii, 108-109) (or from the Franks, according to Cahen, 354). He followed this up with the seizure of Sarvantikar, on the western flank of the Amanus. This led to a rupture with Raymond of Poitiers, count of Antioch, but the quarrel was patched up shortly afterwards when Leo was faced with a new Byzantine threat from the north, and as a token of reconciliation he ceded the plain of Cilicia to Raymond. John Comnenus invaded Cilicia in 1137, and regained all the towns except Anazarba, and in the following year took Leo and his son prisoner. Leo was carried off to Constantinople, where he died in 1142. Once more Cilicia was Byzantine, and remained so until Leo's son, Thoros, who had escaped from Constantinople after accession of Manuel Comnenus in 1143, regained a foothold in upper Cilicia; Thoros II (1145-1169) retook 'Ayn

Zarba and the other towns in Cilicia in 1151-52, and defended them successfully against Mas'ūd, the Saldjūkid of Konya, who fought at the instigation of Manuel Comnenus. Thoros also aided Reynald of Châtillon, count of Antioch, in his attack on Byzantine Cyprus. Manuel Comnenus, however, was not willing to allow the situation to deteriorate any further. In 1158 he invaded Cilicia, reoccupied all the towns, and reduced the country once more to a Byzantine province. The emperor's camp was established at Mardj al-Dibādj (Baltolibadi, north of Mişşisa; see Honigsmann, *Ostgrenze*, 121, and Cahen, 152), and Reynald of Châtillon went there to tender his submission. Thoros, who had taken refuge at Vahka, north of Sis on the upper Sayhān, subsequently did likewise, and in return the emperor made him governor of Mişşisa, 'Ayn Zarba and Vahka, bestowing on him the title of Sebastos. But in 1162, when his brother Sdefanē perished in an ambush laid by the Byzantine governor Andronicus Comnenus, Thoros once more raised the standard of revolt, and seized 'Ayn Zarba together with other Cilician towns. Amalric, king of Jerusalem, intervened to re-establish peace. In 1164 Thoros sided with the Franks in their conflict with Nūr al-Dīn. He died in 1169. His brother Mleh, whom he (Thoros) had exiled, rallied to the side of Nūr al-Dīn, and with the aid of the latter's troops regained possession of Cilicia and obtained official recognition by Manuel Comnenus. He was assassinated in 1175, and his nephew Ruben III succeeded him. The latter was driven by betrayal into the hands of Bohemond III of Antioch, and the price of his release, negotiated by his brother Leo with Hethoum (Het'um, Haythūm) of Lampron, was the cession of Mişşisa, Adana and Tell Hamdūn to Antioch. However, he recaptured them later. In 1187 he abdicated in favour of his brother Leo (1187-1198), who in 1198 became the first king of Armenia-Cilicia when crowned in Tarsus by the Catholics and the papal delegate. It was in Leo's reign that Frederick Barbarossa's Crusade arrived in Cilicia. Frederick was drowned in the Calycadnus (Gök Su), and part of his forces returned to Germany. The remainder were greeted by Leo upon their arrival in Tarsus. His reign was marked by a long conflict with the Saldjūkid of Konya, Kaykā'ūs (1210-1219); the king's troops succeeded in taking the stronghold of Laranda (present-day Karaman) in 1211, but as a consequence of their defeat in 1216 he had to cede Laranda, Lu'lu'a (in the Bozantı region, north of the Cilician Gates) and a part of Cilicia Trachea to the Saldjūkid (Grousset, iii, 266; *Documents arméniens*, i, 644). Another feature of Leo's reign was his constant attempt, after Bohemond's death in 1201, to secure the succession to Antioch for Raymond Ruben. Although Raymond was Bohemond's grandson, he was also the son of Leo's niece Alice, and moreover had been brought up in Armenia. But Raymond had a strong competitor in Bohemond IV, count of Tripoli, who had the support of al-Malik al-Zāhir of Aleppo, and Bohemond IV in the end triumphed.

After Leo's death in 1219, Raymond Ruben tried in vain to win possession of Cilicia. He was taken prisoner at a battle near Tarsus by the bailiff of Constantine, of the Lampron family, and died in captivity (1222). Philip, son of Bohemond IV and his wife Isabelle (Leo's daughter), was crowned his successor. But as he was considered too 'Frankish' and not sufficiently Armenian, he was arrested by Constantine and put to death by poison. This act was one of the reasons which provoked an inter-

vention by 'Alā' al-dīn Kaykubād (1219-37). On the instigation of Bohemond IV, he laid waste the region of Upper Cilicia in 1225 and reduced Constantine to subjection. The latter persuaded the Hospitallers to give him their stronghold at Seleucia, which they had occupied ever since Leo had handed it over to them in 1210. In 1226 Constantine obtained the succession for his son Hethoum, who married Philip's widow Isabella.

Hethoum reigned until 1270, and from the bilingual coins minted under his and Kaykubād's name we know that in the early years of his reign he acknowledged Saldjūkid suzerainty (de Morgan, *Histoire du peuple arménien*, 202-3). With other Muslim and Christian princes he took part in the struggle against Čingiz Khān, but when the Mongol general Bāyḍū crushed the Saldjūkid Kaykhusraw in 1243, he transferred his obedience to the Mongols and surrendered them Kaykhusraw's mother, wife, and daughter. In consequence the Saldjūkids reacted sharply against Cilicia in 1245, and Hethoum was able to avert defeat only by summoning Mongol assistance. His position as a vassal of the Mongols was formalized on several occasions; in 1247 he dispatched the High Constable Sempad to Mongolia; in 1254 he paid a personal visit to the Mongolian court; he supplied Armenian contingents for the Mongolian expedition to Syria, and co-operated in the economic blockade of Egypt by withholding exports of Cilician timber (see Mas-Latrie, *Histoire de Chypre*, i, 412; Grousset, iii, 632). From that time onwards the Armeno-Cilician kingdom, or the land of Sis as Arab historians call it, increasingly became the object of Mamlūk attacks, as the following examples bear witness: (i) 664/1266, a retaliatory expedition under Baybars captured, pillaged, and burnt down Sis, Mişṣiṣa, Adana, Ayās and Tarsus; (ii) 673/1275, another expedition by Baybars seized Mişṣiṣa, Sis, Tarsus and Ayās, and carried out raids into the Taurus; (iii) 682/1283, a campaign under Ḳalā'ūn against Alexandretta, Ayās and Tell Ḥamdūn; (iv) 697/1297, an expedition led by Ladīn against Alexandretta, Tell Ḥamdūn, Sis, Adana, Mişṣiṣa, Nuḍjāyma, etc., during which the strongholds were occupied and a tribute of 500,000 dirhams was imposed; (v) in 703/1303, as the payments had not been made regularly, and as the strongholds were firmly held, a new expedition forced the Armenians to pay the tribute in advance and conformed the surrender of the strongholds; (vi) 705/1305, as a result of further defaults in payment, a new expedition was launched, in which the Mongols rendered assistance to the Armenians and defeated the Mamlūks; but when Egyptian reinforcements arrived, the king had to pay; (vii) 715/1315, the tribute was raised to one million dirhams; (viii) 720/1320; (ix) 722/1322, Ayās was captured, and to the tribute were added 50% of the revenues from the Ayās customs authority and the sale of salt; (x) 735/1335, a further expedition following a reprisal raid by the populace of Ayās on the merchants of Baghdād; (xi) 737/1337, a new expedition launched by Malik Nāṣir Muḥammad because payments of the tribute had stopped. It captured Sis (destroying its citadel in the process) and secured surrender of the forts under the name al-Futūḥāt al-Djāhāniyya (from the Armenian corruption of Djayhān). They included Mişṣiṣa, Kawarrā, Hārūniyya, Sarvantikār, Bayās, Ayās, Nuḍjāyma, and Ḥumaysa. Further raids were carried out in 756/1355 and 760/1359. The frequency of Mamlūk incursions indicates that they did not

consolidate their occupation of the country after each expedition. Then, in 776/1375, a final expedition brought the end of Sis as an independent kingdom. Sis itself fell to the Mamlūks, and Leo V was captured and was not released until 1382. The Armeno-Cilician kingdom became incorporated into the Mamlūk empire (on the above events see the following under relevant dates: al-Maḳrīzī, *Sulūk*, ed. Muṣṭafā Ziyāda, and Quatremère's translation, *Hist. des sult. maml.*; Mufaddāl b. Abi 'l-Faḍā'il, trans. and ed. Blochet, *Patr. Or.* xii & xiv; Abu 'l-Fidā' and his continuator Ibn al-Wardī, Ibn Iyās, Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya*, Abu 'l-Maḥāsin. See also note on the expeditions in *AIEO Alger*, 1939-41, 53-54, with other references, and G. Wiet, *L'Égypte arabe*, vol. iv of the *Histoire de la Nation égyptienne*, 417, 425, 449, 466, 475, 483-484. See also Zetterstéen, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mamluken Sultane*, index; the articles on Mişṣiṣ, ADANA, AYĀS, SIS. For the relations between the Armenians and the Ḳaramān-oghlu, see the article ḲARAMĀN and F. Taeschner, *Al-Umari's Bericht über Anatolien*, index).

A Mamlūk governor, the Turcoman Yüregiroghlu Ramaḍān, who established himself at Adana in 1378, inaugurated the small Ramaḍān-oghullarī [q.v.] dynasty, nominally vassals of the Mamlūks. In 1467 Cilicia was invaded by Shāhsuwār, of the Dhū 'l-Ḳadr [q.v.] dynasty. Between 1485 and 1489 the Ottomans attempted to win control of Cilicia, but it was not until 1516 that they succeeded in doing so, Sulṭān Selim I capturing it during his expedition to Egypt. The Ramaḍān-oghullarī were not removed from power however, and they remained vassals of the Ottomans until the end of the 16th century. Cilicia was then fully integrated into the Ottoman Empire. In 1833 Ibrāhīm Paşa, the son of Meḥmet 'Alī who had revolted against the Porte, carried out a victorious campaign in Cilicia, and the province was ceded to his father by the treaty of Kütaḥya. To this day traces of the campaign can be seen in the Cilician Gates. Cilicia was returned to Turkey in 1840 and became part of the vilayet of Aleppo. In 1866 a military force was sent from Istanbul to assert the authority of the central government over the local derebeys [q.v.] and tribal chiefs. This prepared the way for extensive agricultural settlement, which was accomplished in part with the help of Muslim migrants and repatriates from the Crimea and from the lost Ottoman territories in Europe and North Africa. (Djiewdet Paşa, *Ma'rūdāt*, *TTEM*, no. 14/91, (1926), 117 ff.; W. Eberhard, *Nomads and Farmers in south eastern Turkey; problems of settlement*, *Oriens*, vi (1953), 32-49). It was occupied by French troops from 1918 to 1922, and handed back to Turkey by the Franco-Turkish treaty of Ankara. The plain of Cukurova is now one of the most flourishing agricultural areas in Turkey.

*Bibliography*: Apart from the works mentioned in the text, see, for the classical period, Wellhausen, *Die Kämpfe der Araber mit den Römern in der Zeit der Umayyiden*, in *NKGW Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1901, 414 ff. The texts of Ṭabarī, Ya'qūbī, Balādhuri, *Kitāb al-Uyūn*, etc., are translated by Brooks, *The Arabs in Asia Minor*, 641-750, *JHS*, xviii (1898), 162-206, xix (1899), 19-33, *Byzantine and Arabs in the time of the early Abbassids*, 750-813, *EHR*, xv (1900), 728-747, xvi (1901), 84-92. For the following period, until 959, see Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, i, French ed., ii (in Russian), ii, pt. 2 (texts translated into French). For the Ḥamdānid period, M. Canard, *Sayf al-Daula, Recueil de textes*, Algiers 1934; idem,

*Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdānides*, i, Algiers 1951. For the Crusades and the period immediately preceding them, see Grousset's *Histoire des Croisades*, 3 vols., 1934-36; Runciman's *History of the Crusades*, 3 vols., 1951-4; works mentioned in the text above, by Chalandon, N. Iorga. *Brève histoire de la Petite Arménie d'Arménie Cilicienne*; L. Laurent, de Morgan, Cl. Cahen (index); Michael the Syrian, *Chronique*, translated and edited by Chabot, Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography*, translated and edited by W. Budge, and the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* (western, Armenian and oriental historians). See the article ARMĪNIYA, with its map, which includes Cilicia (note that Cydnus and Tarsus have been wrongly located); and K. J. Barmadjian, map of Cilicia, 1:800,000; also see the articles ADANA, AYĀS, 'AYN ZARBA, MIŞİŞ, SIS, ʦARSŪS, and their respective bibliographies. (M. CANARD)

**CILLA** [see KHALWA]

**ČIMKENT**, chief town of the region of South Kazakhstan of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Kazakhstan, situated on the river Badām, which flows into the river Aris, tributary of the Sīr-Daryā.

The town is mentioned in the *Zaḡar-nāma* of Sharaf al-Dīn Yazdī as a "village" near the city of Sayrām. After its capture by the Kalmūks in 1864, Sayrām declined to the advantage of Čimkent; but at the time of the Russian conquest (1281/1864) Čimkent was still only a fortified market-town, surrounded by a clay wall and dominated by a small citadel. According to the Russian census carried out a little after the conquest, the town comprised 756 houses.

On the eve of the October Revolution, Čimkent was mainly known as a summer resort frequented by the residents of Tāshkent on account of the mildness of its climate and the excellence of its water. It had in 1897 12,500 inhabitants, of whom 800 were Russians and 150 Jews. The environs of Čimkent included at the end of the 19th century numerous prosperous Russian villages and several native villages, of which the most important were Sayrām, and the Asbīdjab or Asfidjab of the Arab geographers.

The very rapid development of the city dates from the Soviet period. In 1926 it comprised 21,000 inhabitants, in 1939 74,200 and in 1956 130,000. Čimkent is an important road centre at the junction of the roads which wend their way from Russia (by way of Aktübinsk and Kzyl-Orda) and from Siberia (by way of Alma-Ata) towards Tāshkent, and is an important railway junction where the Djambul-Aris, Kzyl-Orda and Čimkent-Lenger railways intersect.

Before the Revolution Čimkent was an agricultural centre which subsisted principally from the plantations of cotton (introduced in 1897) and from the harvesting of the medicinal plant *artemisia cinæe* from which santonin is prepared.

Since the discovery in 1932 of veins of lead at Ačisay and Karamazor, and of coal at Lenger, Čimkent has become an important industrial city (factories of chemical and pharmaceutical products, combined with non-ferrous metals). The city included in 1956 35 primary and secondary schools, 19 secondary technical schools and two colleges (the Teachers' Institute and the Technological Institute of Building Materials).

The population of the city is very mixed, the Russians now constituting the majority of the inhabitants; the Muslim community includes Kazakhs and some Özbeks. (CH. QUELQUEJAY)

**ČIN** [see AL-ŠIN]

**CINEMA** (*šinimā*). History. Cinema is a newly imported art into the Muslim world; as such, it is a facet of the Western impact on the inhabitants and expresses their interest in Western technical achievements and forms of entertainment. Silent films were apparently first imported into Egypt by Italians (1897), attracting considerable interest. Film shows for Allied troops, during World War I, familiarized many Near Easterners with the cinema. The influx of foreign films, the construction of entertainment halls, and the intellectual curiosity of the local intelligentsia made Egypt the centre of film shows and afterwards of local production. Most films shown then in the Near East were comedies or Westerns; in Egypt, mainly the former were emulated. Local production by foreign technicians, with Egyptians starring, started on silent films (1917); despite their mediocrity, they were warmly received. Simultaneously, cinema clubs sprang up, which eagerly discussed film-techniques and published in Arabic short-lived cinematic periodicals. Full-length Egyptian silent films were first produced (1927) by, respectively, the directors Widād 'Urī and Lāma Brothers, at a minimum cost. All rather resembled photographed sequences of a play, but were nonetheless welcomed by the public. This success encouraged Yūsuf Wabhī to experiment with a sound film: he took to Paris, for synchronization, an Arab silent film, *Awlād al-dhawāt* (apparently patterned after Fr. Coppée's *Le coupable*), in which he himself had starred. Its enthusiastic reception in Egypt assured the future of the Arabic-speaking film. Arabic film production has been speeded up in the last generation. In 1934, the large *Studio Miṣr* was founded near Cairo; others followed. Halls were built, chiefly in the towns. Production was encouraged, during World War II, by the lack of Italian and German competition. Commercial success led to quantity predominating over quality; the resulting lower standards were due also to inexperience in direction and photography, and to shortage of technical equipment.

Acting and actors. Most Arab filmstars are in Egypt. Some former theatre actors or singers are idolized, e.g., leadingmen: the late comedians 'Alī al-Kassār and Naḍīb al-Riḥānī, the living Yūsuf Wabhī, protagonist of the "social" film on local themes. Some leading ladies can act in character roles; most others sing well.

Characteristics and Themes. The Arabic-speaking film has been, until recently, rather imitative of its European or American counterpart, but artistic and technical standards are generally lower. While in recent years the overriding importance of music has somewhat declined, it is still customary to introduce a sub-plot that includes vocal and instrumental Arabic music and dancing. Another drawback to the plot is the somewhat faulty script-writing, due to the limited experience of local actors-authors. While scripts adapted from foreign films, plays or novels (e.g., *al-Bu'asā* = *Les misérables*, with 'Abbās Fāris) were usually successful, those frequently composed at the bid of a producer-actor have often resulted in an unimaginative plot. The main types of films are: *a.* the historical (generally on themes chosen from Arab or Islamic history; in Egypt—also from Pharaonic times). *b.* the social drama or melodrama (once popular for its tear-jerking appeal, later for its social aims). *c.* the musical. *d.* the comedy or slapstick farce (usually on local background). *e.* adventure